

Attorney Docket No. MSU 4.1-456
Appl. No. 09/764,686
Am dt. Dated: November 13, 2003
Reply to Office Action of 10/07/2003

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 to 53 are pending. Claims 3 to 7, and 35 to 51 are allowed. Claims 8 to 34 were objected to because of a dependence upon rejected claims that were allowable. Claims 1, 2, 52 and 53 were rejected. Claim 8 has been cancelled.

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to incorporate the limitations of allowable Claim 8. The definition of x being ≥ 0 is corrected in the independent claims. This is as shown in Claim 15 for instance. The language of original Claim 8 has been inserted in the specification with the change.

Claims 1, 2, 52 and 53 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) over various references. These rejections are obviated by the Amendments to Claims 1 and 2. In any event the references do not suggest the claimed hybrid compositions. Reconsideration is requested.

It is now believed that Claims 1 to 7 and 9 to 53 are in condition for allowance. Notice of Allowance is requested.

Respectfully,



Ian C. McLeod
Registration No. 20,931

McLeod & Moyne, P.C.
2190 Commons Parkway
Okemos, Michigan 48864
(517) 347-4100